



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE EIGHT-BOOK TRADITION OF PLINY'S *LETTERS* IN VERONA

BY ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

In the *Rheinisches Museum*, Vol. LVIII (1903), pp. 467-71, Professor Karl Lohmeyer published an account of certain quotations from Pliny's *Letters* given in a MS *florilegium* composed in the year 1329, probably in Verona, where it now reposes in the Capitular Library of the cathedral (No. CLXVIII). Professor Lohmeyer also discussed the knowledge of Pliny's *Letters* shown by Iohannes [de Matociis], *mansionarius* at Verona, who composed in the second decade of the same fourteenth century a voluminous *Historia Imperialis* (cf., *inter alia*, cod. Bibl. Capit. Veron. CCIV), and at some time not far removed a biographical note on the two Plinies, commonly entitled *Brevis adnotatio de duobus Pliniis*, and not infrequently found appended, or prefixed, to MSS of the Natural History, or of the eight-book tradition of the *Letters* (cf., *inter alia*, in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, cod. Auct. F. ii. 22; cod. Laud. MS Lat. 52; cod. MS Linc. Coll. (e) Lat. 77: in the Cambridge University Library, cod. I. 347: in the British Museum, cod. Harl. 4868: in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, cod. 8622: in the Hofbibliothek at Vienna, cod. 48: in the Laurentian Library at Florence, cod. 47.34: in the Vatican Library, cod. Vat. lat. 5106; cod. Vat. lat. 3405; cod. Regin. 1472). Every Plinian scholar is also acquainted with the views of Remigio Sabbadini on the same subject, published in his *Scoperte*, and *Scuola di Guarino*, in the *Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica*, and elsewhere.

I may perhaps be allowed a few brief remarks on the same theme, prompted by some study of the text-tradition of Pliny's *Letters*, and by a recent visit to Verona, where, by the kindness of the librarian of the Capitular Library, Don Antonio Spagnolo, I was permitted to study and copy the excerpts in the *Flores moralium auctoritatum*, and to make other researches.

There seems to be no reason to doubt that the anonymous codex of the *Flores moralium auctoritatum maxime utilitatis et honoris*, as

it is called in the colophon, is an autograph, and that it was composed in the library where it is still preserved. The authors quoted in it appear all to have been represented at that time by MSS in the Capitular Library. But, as regards Pliny, at least, there is no inference to be drawn about the order of the letters in the MS used by the "florist" (if I may so term him); for the edifying apothegms from many sources are arranged by him in three books under a considerable number of chapter-headings, according to subject; and therefore the order of the citations from a given author could not be influenced by the order within his works, unless perhaps a number of quotations from the same author should appear in the same chapter. This last is not the case with the quotations from Plin. *Ep.* v. 9 and v. 20, cited by Lohmeyer as indicating that, in the MS of the Letters used by the florist, v. 9 stood after v. 20. These quotations in the *Flores* are in different chapters. Again, there has been no such correction of the book-number in the second (in the florist's order) of these quotations as Lohmeyer records. The numeral 6 stands perfectly clear and uncorrected. But, it may be remarked, the quotation from vi. 2. 8 is assigned to book 5 (the florist uses sometimes Arabic and sometimes Roman numerals), and two from iv. 16 to book v, along with one from v. 17. 3.

Nor can I agree with Lohmeyer that the fact that the last quotation from the *Letters* (not the last in the florist's order, however) is the smug apothegm that concludes book vii is any indication that the MS of the *Letters* from which the quotations were taken did not include book ix (of course numbered as viii—for there is no reason to doubt that here we have to do with an eight-book text). It is too great a strain upon the imagination of the historian of the text-tradition of Pliny's *Letters* to believe, in the lack of other evidence, that the MS of that work existing, doubtless, in 1329 and earlier, in the Capitular Library at Verona, and used there by the anonymous compiler of the *Flores moralium auctoritatum*, was any other than the MS used at about the same time by Iohannes, the Mansionarius, (doubtless in the same library) which clearly contained eight books. On the other hand, the florist appears to have been rather a dull fellow (he even blunders in the same way as the "Wicked" Bible, for he leaves out Pliny's negative in vi. 22. 8), and it is quite easily

conceivable that he stopped his (surely somewhat careless) excerpting of Pliny before he had finished the volume, or that, in his haste (he says apologetically in his colophon that the *flores* were *sub breui interuallo conditi*), he struck nothing in the eighth (really ninth) book that he thought worth quoting. The total number of quotations from Pliny in the *Flores* is not so great, after all. Nor can the confusion in order of the letters of book ix in the eight-book tradition be held to strengthen in any way, as Lohmeyer suggested, the notion that the ninth book had not yet been appended to the first seven. The fifth book also in the same tradition shows a different order of the letters from that found in the two other MS-families. And to postulate thus gratuitously yet another separate, and now utterly untraceable, source for the ninth book is altogether to violate logical probability. The easier explanation is surely here, as often, the more satisfactory.

Most, if not all, of recent utterances concerning Iohannes, the Veronese Mansionarius, appear to depend upon the conclusions reached by Girolamo Tartarotti, whose "letters" on that subject were reprinted at Venice, in 1754, in the volume entitled *Memorie antiche di Rovereto* (pp. 130 ff.). Tartarotti rightly concluded that the Mansionarius wrote his *Historia imperialis* (which has apparently never been printed) in the second decade of the fourteenth century; for in the earlier part of his book the author mentions the current year as 1313, and in the later part, as 1320 (*ab ipso Othone, qui coepit anno Domini DCCCCLXII usque in annum Domini praesentem MCCCXX computantur anni CCCLVII*). But Tartarotti further believed that the *Brevis adnotatio de duobus Pliniis* must have been composed at a later date than the *Historia*, merely because of an observed difference in the title by which Pliny the Younger is referred to in the two works.

I have been unable to find any real evidence concerning the precise date of composition of the *Brevis adnotatio*. All of the copies of it that I have been able to trace are of the fifteenth century. There is apparently no copy in the Capitular Library at Verona. Tartarotti knew only two copies in the Vatican Library, apparently two of the three that I have mentioned above. He was doubtless correct, as against Scipione Maffei, in identifying the author of each

of the two works as one and the same man, and as the Iohannes Mansionarius Veronensis mentioned by Panvinio and Pastrengo. The Mansionarius was known by Tartarotti to have been alive only as late as 1328 (*loc. cit.*, p. 155), but an early MS note in the copy of the *Memorie* in the Hofbibliothek at Vienna says that on p. 206, col. 2, of the *Serie cronologica de' Vescovi, Arcipreti*, etc., by Canon Gio. Giacompo Dionisi, contained in the *Nuova Difesa di tre Documenti Veronesi* by Canon Francesco Florio, one may read, "Sotti Giovanni di Forlì Arciprete fiori il celebre Istorico Giovanni Diacono, visse nella Canonica dall' anno 1307 fino al 1347." Sabbadini, however, in *Scoperte dei Codici*, p. 2, n. 5, quotes L. Simeoni (in *La Famiglia di Giovanni Mansionario*, Verona, 1903) as assigning the death of the Mansionarius to December, 1337. Of Simeoni's conclusions regarding the date of composition of *Historia* and *Brevis adnotatio* I know nothing.

In the lack, then, of definite evidence concerning the date of composition of the *Brevis adnotatio* within these rather wide limits, the question is whether Tartarotti was right in the inference that he drew. I fail to see that he was. The basis for judgment is as follows. In the *Historia imperialis* (cod. Bibl. Capit. Veron. CCIV,¹ fol. 8^u) the Mansionarius writes, "Eo tempore [*sc.* Traiani] Plinius orator et ystoricus, natione ueronensis, nunc [*l. ut*] in quadam ystoria legitur, floruit, qui Plinius secundus, cum prouinciam syriam regeret, etc." (following with a note on the persecution of the Christians taken from the usual Christian sources). In the *Brevis adnotatio* the author says, "Plinii duo fuisse noscuntur, eodem nomine et prænominibus appellati, hoc titulo, 'C. Plinius Secundus Veronensis Orator'. . . . Iunior Plinius titulum habet talem, 'Caii Plinii Secundi Oratoris Veronensis Nouocomensis.'" In these two passages, then, Tartarotti thought he saw an inconsistency that could be explained only on the theory that the *Adnotatio* was composed later than the *Historia*, and in the interval the author had first become acquainted with (Tartarotti does not say, as some of his followers do, "discovered") a MS of Pliny's *Letters* that bore the longer title specified, and that first informed him on the distinction

¹This MS is probably the one said by Tartarotti to be in the possession of Scipione Maffei: the only other MS of the *Historia* known to Tartarotti was in the Bibl. Valli-celliana at Rome.

between the uncle and the nephew, which had been previously unknown to him, as apparently to most or all mediaeval writers.

It must at once be conceded that the genitive form of the name of the younger Pliny in the *Adnotatio*, and its occurrence in substantially the same style in certain extant MSS of the eight-book class, point to the fact that it was copied by the Mansionarius from a codex of the *Letters* with which he was acquainted. Later on in the *Adnotatio* he says, "Fecit etiam Plinius iste epistolarum suarum ad septitium libros octo;" and concludes with, "Haec et alia suarum epistolarum libris et in iis quae superius memoravi diligens lector inueniet." But such an inconsistency as Tartarotti imagined between the *Historia* and the *Adnotatio* does not appear. In the former work Pliny is called *orator et ystoricus*, and in the latter he is declared to be the same (*fuert autem Plinii magni philosophi et summi oratores ac historici*). In the former work he is said to be *natione Veronensis*, and in the latter the same thing is affirmed (*quod autem fuerit Veronensis ponit libri sexti epistula ultima ad Maximum*): but the author states that he was also styled *Nouocomensis*, because he had recently gone to reside on Lake Como.

Nor apart from all questions of a MS of the *Letters*, could the Mansionarius well have been ignorant at the time of writing the *Historia* that the younger Pliny might properly be termed *Nouocomensis*. The *Speculum historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais (†1264) was very well known to the Mansionarius before he composed the *Historia*, and Vincent's reference to Pliny is directly cited by him in the *Adnotatio*, and doubtless also was before him when he wrote the note in the *Historia*. That reference stands in cod. Vat. lat. 1962, Lib. xi (comm. x), c. 67, and in it Pliny is called *Plinius Secundus [No] uocomensis orator et historicus insignis*. If the Mansionarius chose to mention him in the *Historia* only as *natione Veronensis*, it could not have been for lack of further knowledge about him, unless the MSS of the *Speculum historiale* did not all read alike on the point referred to.

It is worth while to notice yet another point. Vincent of Beauvais had not earlier been acquainted with Pliny's *Letters*, and speaks of his new knowledge with the natural pleasure of a dis-

coverer (*eiusdem [Plinii] epistulas ad diuersos circiter centum reperi*). The Mansionarius, on the other hand, mentions the eight books of the *Letters* quite unconcernedly, as he naturally would a work that had been represented by a MS in his Chapter Library for an indefinite time, and was by no means a new thing to him, nor, as he supposed, would be, in other copies, to other students. It was apparently not a source that he thought unique. He was of course aware that Vincent of Beauvais, and plenty of other mediaeval writers, copying from one another, had confused the two Plinies, and he thought it worth while to write a brief biographical note to guard against that error for the future. But he professed to have no newly discovered material. Any *diligens lector*, he says, reading Pliny's *Letters* and "the other writers mentioned above"—Jerome, Beda, Vincent, Hugo, Eusebius, and other historians—could readily inform himself on the topic concerned. It is to me quite inconceivable that he should write in this way, if, after long years of study and practice as a historian, in the course of which he had repeated vague statements about Pliny without first-hand knowledge, he had suddenly come upon a MS of the *Letters*.

It doubtless would have been better for the Mansionarius to state in his *Historia* that he was speaking of the Pliny otherwise called *Nouocomensis*, although *natione Veronensis*; for this scrupulosity on his part would have saved more recent critics from much doubt. But the reference was only a brief one, for the purpose of mentioning, in duly pious form, the persecution, and not for the sake of mentioning Pliny. Hence there was nothing to prompt any careful discrimination at this point between the two men of the same name. It would have been quite otherwise, if the author were at the moment thinking more of the man than of the event. As it was, the common form of reference sufficed. And it is useless to expect of the Mansionarius, any more than of other men of the period, like Vincent (cf. n. 1 below), consistency and accuracy. Much

¹This was doubtless cod. Beluacensis (postea Riccardianus), nunc Ashburnham 98, now in the Medicean Library. It may be remarked, as an indication that the Mansionarius was not alone in inconsistency (cf. p. 181) that though Vincent's codex contained Plin. *Ep.* iii. 5 (on the works of the elder Pliny), his text in this immediate connection still makes the two men into one, ascribing both *Letters* and *Natural History* to the same author.

more striking inconsistencies and inaccuracies than this concerning the name are ready at hand. In the *Historia* Pliny is said to have been governor of Syria at the time of the persecution; in the *Adnotatio* he is termed *praeses Hispaniarum*. The author does not feel called upon to comment on the disagreement between his own utterances, and, indeed, might be supposed to be serenely unconscious that any disagreement exists. Again, in the same paragraph of the *Adnotatio* he quotes "Suetonius Tranquillus" as authority for the statement that the elder Pliny was smothered under the ashes of Etna, and yet calmly refers to Plin. *Ep.* vi. 16, which he must have known gives quite a different story. The Mansionarius certainly was aware that Campania is not Sicily, and Vesuvius is not Etna. But, as was the case with Vincent in the instance cited, the different sections of his doubtless somewhat overloaded memory were not always geared together. He could at any given moment set down what happened to stand in his immediate source, without thinking of correcting it by his other knowledge. That is certainly what he did more than once in the *Adnotatio*; it is probably what he did in the given passage of the *Historia*.

I think it must certainly be concluded that Tartarotti's point was not well taken, and should not have commanded the following of recent critical writers. The variation between the statements in *Historia* and *Adnotatio* is a fortuitous and unimportant thing. It is no evidence that the two Plinies were really confused in the writer's mind, though they may have been in the mind of the predecessor from whom the passage in the *Historia* was copied. The Mansionarius had every reason, even when he was composing the *Historia*, to know the younger Pliny as both *Veronensis* and *Nouocomensis*. There is therefore no evidence to show that the *Adnotatio* was written after the *Historia*; and especially all the evidence is directly against the theory that an eight-book codex of Pliny's *Letters*, previously unknown, had suddenly turned up in Verona within the few years following the completion of the *Historia imperialis* (1320, or soon thereafter).

Ratherius (890-974 A. D.), bishop of Verona, who seems to have used the treasures of the Capitular Library to good purpose, was certainly acquainted with the *Letters* of Pliny; but the one direct

quotation that he makes is of a sentence which stands in all three of the MS-families, and in the same form. But the fact that he knew the *Letters* suggests that the Chapter Library in his time contained a MS of them; and there is no reason to suppose it other than the one later known to be there.

I can but believe, therefore, as the case appears to stand, that the Chapter Library at Verona, from a time before the days of Ratherius, had possessed one MS of Pliny's *Letters*, and only one; this MS contained books i-vii and ix; it was known to, and used by, Iohannes de Matociis, the Mansionarius, and by the anonymous compiler of the *Flores moralium auctoritatum*.

I may perhaps venture to express one other bit of skepticism, though I must refrain from discursive argument. I find myself unable to believe, with Sabbadini, that the three-column (Spanish uncial?) MS of Pliny's *Letters*, containing eight books, that came in 1419 into the possession of Guarino Guarini, could possibly have been other than this one codex of that content that had been reposing in the Chapter Library at Verona since before the days of Ratherius (cf. R. Sabbadini *Scoperte dei Codici*, p. 96; *Scuola di Guarino*, p. 115; *Mus. Ital. di Antich. Class.*, II, p. 432; *Epistolario di Guarino*, No. 486). Of course we must suppose some dishonesty in removing the MS from the Chapter Library at Verona, to which theft Guarino may or may not have been accessory before or after the fact. If the letter in which he announces the acquisition to his friend was actually written from Venice, may not the stolen goods have been carried there for greater safety, whether before they were offered to Guarino, or even by him after acquisition? The *nudius tertius* (cf. letter cited above) is itself no block in the way of this supposition, considering the comparatively short distance between the two cities. I would not wantonly slander the honest memory of a renaissance scholar, but in consideration of certain known facts concerning ideas about property in books prevalent at that day (and I fear to some extent in our own), one need not be too finical about suspicions. Guarino was of Verona, and probably knew what the Chapter Library contained; and in the lack of other evidence, there is no reason to suppose that the eight-book MS of Pliny's *Letters* used a century before by the florist and the

historian had meanwhile vanished without leaving a further trace behind. Other MSS had indeed been abstracted from the Chapter Library, and are now lost: Catullus and the *Letters* of Cicero to Atticus, Quintus, and Brutus—possibly also Ausonius—may be cited as examples; but these at any rate have left descendants.

In my study of the eight-book MSS, which has recently been further extended, I have been unable to trace any indication of a double source for such MSS within the early fifteenth century. All the probabilities, antecedent and otherwise, appear to me to be in favor of the belief that the MS of Pliny's *Letters* acquired by Guarino came from the Chapter Library at Verona, and was the one used by Ratherius, by Iohannes de Matociis, and by the anonymous florist.¹

As the quotations from Pliny's *Letters* in the *Flores* are apparently, so far as they go, our earliest (except for the *Brevis adnotatio*) and most immediate witness to the text of the eight-book tradition, and as they have not, I think, been printed in full, it may be of some interest to students of the *Letters* to reproduce them here. They are given in the order in which they stand in the MS; preceding each is the indication of its folio and column there; following each, its reference to the proper place in the *Letters*; abbreviations are for the most part expanded, but otherwise the spelling of the original is retained:

EX COD. BIBL. CAPIT. VERON. CLXVIII (*Flores moralium auctoritatum*):

f. 5^r, c. 2.—Plinius libro .i. epistularum, xiiii^a epistula: Scias ipsum plurimis uirtutibus habundare, qui alienas sic amat (i. 17. 4):

f. 5^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro .4. epistularum, .xxv. epistula: Vbique uitia remediis fortiora (iv. 25. 5):

f. 6^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro .3. epistularum, .ix. epistula: Fides in praesentia eos quibus resistit offendit deinde ab illis ipsis suspicitur laudaturque (iii. 9. 26):

f. 6^u, c. 1.—Plinius in secundo epistularum: Dispice ne sit parum prouidum sperare ex aliis, quod tibi ipse non praestes (ii. 10. 5):

¹I see no reason to believe, with Sabbadini (cf. *Scoperte*, p. 3), that the Mansionarius made a copy of Pliny's letters from the Veronese codex, or owned one himself. He probably appended his *Brevis adnotatio* to the codex in the Chapter Library, from which it finally was spread abroad through the instrumentality of Guarinus (cf. also the ascription of the *Adnotatio* to Guarinus himself in cod. Vat. Lat. 5106, cited on p. 186, n. 2).

f. 8^r, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·i^o. epistularum: Vt enim de pictore, sculptore, fictore nisi artifex iudicare ita nisi sit sapiens non potest percipere sapientem (i. 10. 4):

f. 8^u, c. 2.—Plinius in primo epistularum: Pompeius Iulianus tum cetera uita, tum uel hoc uno magnus et clarus quod ipse prouincie princeps inter altissimas condiciones generum non honoribus principem sed sapientia elegit (i. 10. 8):

f. 9^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·i· epistularum: Stultissimum credo ad imitandum non optima queque proponere (i. 5. 13):

f. 10^r, c. 1.—Plinius in ·i^o. epistularum: Stultissimum credo ad imitandum non optima queque proponere (i. 5. 13)¹:

f. 11^r, c. 1.—Plinius primo epistularum: Si humiles et sordidas curas aliis mandas et ipse te in isto alto pingui que secessu studiis asseris . hoc sit negotium tuum, hic labor, hec requies, in his uigilie in his etiam somnus reponatur. Effinge aliquid et excude quod sit perpetuo tuum, nam reliqua rerum tuarum post te alium atque alium dominum sortiuntur, hoc nunquam tuum desinet esse si semel ceperit (i. 3. 3):

f. 11^r, c. 2.—Plinius libro primo epistularum: Proinde cum uenabere licebit auctore me ut panarium et langunculam, sit etiam pugillares feras experieris non dianam magis montibus quam mineruam inerrare (i. 6. 3):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·3· epistularum: Perire omne tempus arbitrabatur quod studiis non impenderet [*contractio fortasse legenda* impenderetur] (iii. 5. 16):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·2· epistularum: Legendi semper occasio est, audiendi non semper praeterea [*contractio fortasse legenda* propterea] multo magis ut uulgo dicitur uiua uox afficit, non licet acriora sint que legas altius tamen in animo sedent que pronuntiat uultus habitus gestus etiam dicentis affigit (ii. 3. 9):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Plinius in ·v· epistularum: Studeamus ergo, nec desidiae nostre protendamus alienam sunt qui audiant sunt qui legant, nos modo dignum aliquid auribus dignum cartis elaboremus (iv. 16. 3):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Idem in eodem: Adhuc honor studiis durat (iv. 16. 1):

f. 11^u, c. 1.—Idem in eodem: Et enim nescio quo pacto magis in studiis timor quam fiducia decet (v. 17. 3):

f. 11^u, c. 2.—Plinius in ·vi· epistularum: Quid enim aut publice aut letius quam clarissimos iuuenes nomen et famam ex studiis petere aut mihi optatius quam me ad recta tendentibus quasi exemplar esse propositum (vi. 11. 3):

f. 11^u, c. 2.—Plinius in ·vi· epistularum: Equidem omnes qui aliquid in studiis faciunt uenerari mirari que soleo, est enim res difficilis ardua fastidiosa, et que eos a quibus contempnitur contempnatur (vi. 17. 5):

¹This repetition occurs in the same chapter of the *Flores* (*De imprudentia, stulticia, temeritate, ignorantia*) as the quotation just before, but with different abbreviations in the script.

f. 12^r, c. 2.—Plinius in primo epistularum: Mecum tantum et cum libellis loquor. o regiam sinceramque uitam odulce otium honestum que, ac pene omni negotio dulcius omare, o litus secretum que musionum, quam multa inuenitis quam multa dicatis [*fort. ditatis*] (i. 9. 5, 6):

f. 12^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·2· epistularum. xi^a epistula: Inscitum est mortalibus studium magna et inusitata noscendi, sed fugien [*sed fugien manus prima deleuit*] (ii. 11. 10):

f. 13^r, c. 2.—Plinius libro ·i^o· epistularum: Affirmant etiam esse hanc phylosophie pulcerrimam partem, agere negotium publicum cognoscere iudicare promere et exercere iustitiam (i. 10. 10):

f. 15^r, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·v· epistula ·xx^a·. Multum conuendatiore [*fortasse conuendationis*] et detrahit et affert memoria, uox, gestus (v. 20. 3):

f. 15^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·6· epistularum: Est omnino inimicum sed usu receptum quod honesta consilia uel turpia prout male aut prospere cedunt, ita uel procedunt uel reprehenduntur. Inde plerumque eadem facta modo libertatis modo furoris nomen accipiunt (v. 9. 7):

f. 18^r, c. 2.—Plinius libro primo epistularum: Neque enim minus in perspicua in certa fallacia sunt iudicum ingenia quam tempestatum terrarum que (i. 20. 17):

f. 18^r, c. 2.—Idem in eodem libro 5: Primam religionis sue iudex patientiam debet, que pars magna iustitie est, et quedam superuacua dicuntur etiam satius est et hec dici quam non dici necessaria (vi. 2. 8):

f. 19^r, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·2· epistula ·iii· : Nos qui in foro uerisque litibus terimur multum malitie quamuis nolimus adiscimus, scola et auditorium ut ficta [*post ficta una littera erasa*] causa, res inermis innoxia est (ii. 3. 5, 6):

f. 19^r, c. 1.—Idem libro ·2· xii^a epistula: Numerantur enim sententie non poderantur, nec aliud in publico consilio potest fieri in quo nichil est tam inequale quam equalitas Nam cum sit impar prudentia, par omnium ius est (ii. 12. 5):

f. 19^u, c. 1.—Plinius libro ·vii^o· [*corr. m. 1 ex ·ii·*] epistularum: Optime autem reuerentia pudor metus iudicant (vii. 17. 8):

f. 21^r, c. 2.—Plinius in [*numero libri in lacuna omisso*] epistularum: Neque enim congruens arbitror, ut quem augere honoribus cupias huic pietatis titulis inuidere qui sunt omnibus honoribus pulciores (iii. 8. 2):

f. 21^u, c. 2.—Plinius in ·5· epistularum: Et secundis gratia casibus et aduersis caret (v. 20. 3):

f. 23^r, c. 1.—Plinius in ·vi· epistularum: Tam iocundum est uindicari quam decipi miserum (vi. 22. 8):

f. 23^u, c. 1.—Plinius in ·vii· epistularum: Nec hystoria debet egredi [*egredi corr. man. prima ex egregi*] ueritatem, et honeste factis ueritas sufficit (vii. 33. 10):

f. 26^a, c. 2.—Plinius libro .5. epistularum: Amicos plures habere multis gloriosum reprehensioni nemini fuit (v. 3. 11):

The text of the *Brevis adnotatio* is also of some interest in the same connection, if only for its quotation of some passages from the same MS of Pliny's *Letters*. But as Tartarotti, though professing to follow the older (as he judged it) of the two Vatican MSS known to him, printed a much garbled version quite out of accord with any one of the three MSS known to me to be now in that Library, and as I do not recall that it has since been reprinted, unless by A. I. a Turre Rezzonici,¹ whose *Disquisitiones Plinianae* (Parma, 1763) I have not seen, I append here for good measure, and for reference from my foregoing argument, a text of the *Brevis adnotatio* based on eight of the MSS mentioned above (p. 175). For collations of seven of these I have to thank Miss Dora Johnson, recently fellow in Latin in the University of Chicago, and now a student in the American School of Classical Studies in Rome. I have not thought it worth while to supply a complete *apparatus criticus*, except for the three quotations from Pliny's *Letters*; but I have not hesitated to correct spelling and punctuation, while leaving the curious grammar and vocabulary untouched.

The MSS used are:

Auct. F. ii. 22 (Bodleianus) = a.	Vindob. 48 = e.
Laud. MS. Lat. 52 (Bodleianus) = b.	Vatic. Lat. 3405 = f.
MS Linc. Coll. (e) Lat. 77 (Bodleianus) = c.	Vatic. Lat. 5106 = g.
Harl. 4868 (Mus. Brit.) = d.	Regin. 1472 (Vatic.) = h.

BREVIS ADNOTATIO DE DVOBUS PLINIIS VERONENSIBUS EX MVLTIS HIC COLLECTA PER IOHANNEM MANSIONARIVM VERONENSEM²

Plinii duo fuisse noscuntur, eodem nomine et praenominibus appellati, hoc titulo, "Gaius Plinius Secundus Veronensis Orator." In priore Plinio hoc nomen [scilicet] Secundus denotat praenominationem; in altero

¹Since this article was put into type I have been kindly informed by Professor Sabbadini, whom I have to thank also for other courtesies, that the *Adnotatio* has just been edited, or will shortly be edited, by Sig. Carlo Cipolla in *Miscellanea Ceriani* (Milano: Hoepli, 1910).

²Codd. c and h add *Oratoribus* after *Veronensibus*. In e the title runs, *Duorum Pliniorum Veronensium Vita per Iohannem Mansionarium Veronensem Breuiter Adnotata foeliciter incipit*; in f, *De Duobus Pliniis Collecta Breuiter*; in g, *Guarini ueronensis super plinii secundi epistolis*.

uero innuit ordinem numeri, ut sit a primo secundus. Iunior Plinius titulum habet talem, "Gaii Plinii Secundi Oratoris Veronensis Nouocomensis," quod uidelicet praenomen "Nouocomensis," potius quam gentile, insinuare uidetur quod "nouus" habitator "Comensis" (et praecipue iuxta Lacum Larium, qui Comanus dicitur) hic Plinius habitauerit, ubi fundos amplissimos habuit, ut colligitur eiusdem Plinii iunioris epistula ultima quarti libri ad Suram. Quod autem fuerit Veronensis, ponit libri sexti epistula ultima ad Maximum. Maior Plinius de se ipso dicit quod fuerit patria Veronensis in principio prooemii librorum *Naturalis Historiae*: nam introducens exemplum Valerii Catulli poetae Veronensis eum conterraneum suum uocat, scribens ad Vespasianum Augustum.

Fuerunt autem Plinii magni philosophi et summi oratores ac historici, nobilissimo genere orti, equites Romani et senatores, et ad omnia dignitatum officia meritis exigentibus promoti usque ad consularitatis insignia. Prior Plinius fuit auunculus iunioris, et ille ex sorore nepos, ut testatur ipse iunior libro tertio epistularum epistula quinta ad Macrum,¹ ubi de primo Plinio sic refert, "Pergratum est mihi quod tam diligenter libros auunculi mei lectitas, ut habere omnes² uelis,³ quaerasque qui sint omnes. Fungar indicis partibus, atque etiam quo sint⁴ ordine scripti notum tibi faciam. Est enim haec⁵ quoque⁶ studiosis non iniucunda cognitio." Scripsit autem Plinius maior, ut breuiter ex praefata epistula colligitur, *De Iaculatione Equestri* librum unum, *De Vita Pomponii Secundi* libros duos, *Bellorum Germaniae Factorum* libros uiginti; in arte rhetorica *De Institutione Oratoris* libros sex, *Dubii Sermonis* libros octo; tempore Neronis Imperatoris *Historiarum a Fine Aufidii Bassi* libros triginta et unum; *Naturalis Historiae* libros septem et triginta; et multa alia quae non habentur. De ipso refert Suetonius Tranquillus quod ualde miratur quod uir militaribus officiis deditus tanta componere potuit etiam ratione uitae. Nam, ut dicit Suetonius idem in libro *De Viris Illustribus*, dum idem Plinius legiones in Siciliam duceret, eruptione fauillarum ab Aetna eructantium praefocatus interiit anno uitae suae quinquagesimo sexto, et in Sicilia tumulatur: cui consonat Plinius nepos eius in praefata epistula ad Macrum⁷ dicens, "Miraris quod⁸ tot uolumina multaque in his scrupulosa homo occupatus absoluerit. Magis miraberis, si scieris illum aliquandiu causas⁹ dictitasse,¹⁰ et decessisse anno sexto et quinquagesimo¹¹."

¹macrum abeg, marcum cdhf.

²omnes abg, omnis (corr. ex omnes d) cdefh.

³uelis (corr. ex uelles d) abcdgf, uelles eh.

⁴sunt g, sint rell.

⁷macrum abeg, marcum cdhf.

⁵haec bcfgh, hic a, om. de.

⁸quod bcegh, quot adf.

⁶quaque h, quoque rell.

⁹causas defgh, om. abc.

¹⁰dictitasse abdefh, dictasse c, actitasse g.

¹¹sexto et quinquagesimo abdefh, -VI- & L- c, sexto quinquagesimo g.

De morte uero ipsius, quia praesens erat, iunior Plinius scribit plenissime ad Cornelium Tacitum libri sexti epistula sexta decima.

Plinius iunior maioris Plinii ex sorore nepos: sic bonarum uirtutum studiis est auunculum imitatus, ut esset idem numero, si materia¹ posset in altero. Nam et iste per omnia officia Romanae urbis promotus consul fuit, deinde Africae proconsul, et postmodum praeses Hispaniarum. Hic, ut scribunt Hieronymus, Beda, et Vincentius, Hugo, et alii in Chronicis, et Eusebius Caesariensis in tertio Ecclesiasticae Historiae, dum praeses Hispaniarum esset, uidens Christianos sine causa crudeliter interfici, scripsit Imperatori Traiano, ut persecutionem Christianorum cohibere dignaretur, eo quod nihil contra Romanas agerent leges: hoc solum inuenerit² in eis, quod nescio quem Christum, eorum deum, ut dicit, ante lucanum adorant. Hic senex Romae decessit. Scripsit autem et iste libros Historiarum a principio [mundi] usque ad tempus suum LXXXVIII³ in quibus imitatur auunculum, ut de se dicit libro quinto epistularum epistula octaua ad Capitonem. Ait enim, "Me ad hoc studium⁴ historiarum impellit domesticum⁵ exemplum. Auunculus meus idemque per adoptionem pater, historias equidem⁶ religiosissime scripsit." Fecit etiam Plinius iste Epistularum suarum ad Septicium libros octo; De Institutione Artium Liberalium libros septem; Librum Virorum Illustrium a Proca rege Albanorum usque ad Cleopatram in nonaginta octo capitulis, secundum ipsorum uirorum numerum, in quo uitas ipsorum et merita mirabili et aperta breuitate describit; De Tripartitione Orbis libros sex. Item in poemate floruit. Hic auunculi uitam imitatus et mores etiam in otio aut scripsit aut legit; et si erat etiam in uenatu seu in itinere, sicut et auunculus, notarium habebat, cui equitando dictabat, ut de se dicit ad Cornelium Tacitum primi libri epistula sexta. Haec et alia suarum epistularum libris et in iis quae superius memoraui diligens lector inueniet. Vale.

¹ *lege natura, mā ex nā?*

² *inuenerit deh, inueniret f, inuenitur abcg.*

³ *LXXXVIII efh, octo et octaginta d, LXXVIII ag, LXXIX b, LXXVII c.*
studium in g, studium rell.

impellit domesticum abcg, domesticum impellit defh.

equidem abcg, quidem defh, et quidem codd. Plin.